

Washington University in St. Louis Washington University Open Scholarship

Biology Faculty Publications & Presentations

Biology

5-16-2017

Sexual selection, speciation and constraints on geographical range overlap in birds

Christopher Cooney

Joseph A. Tobias

Jason T. Weir

Carlos A. Botero

Washington University in St. Louis, cbotero@wustl.edu

Nathalie Seddon

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/bio_facpubs



Part of the [Behavior and Ethology Commons](#), [Biology Commons](#), and the [Population Biology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cooney, Christopher; Tobias, Joseph A.; Weir, Jason T.; Botero, Carlos A.; and Seddon, Nathalie, "Sexual selection, speciation and constraints on geographical range overlap in birds" (2017). *Biology Faculty Publications & Presentations*. 139.
https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/bio_facpubs/139

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Biology at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Biology Faculty Publications & Presentations by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

Sexual selection, speciation, and constraints on geographical range overlap in birds

Christopher R. Cooney^{1,2*}, Joseph A. Tobias^{1,3}, Jason T. Weir⁴, Carlos A. Botero⁵ & Nathalie Seddon¹

¹*Edward Grey Institute, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PS, UK.*

²*Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Western Bank, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK.*

³*Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, Silwood Park, Buckhurst Road, Ascot, Berkshire, SL5 7PY, UK.*

⁴*Department Ecology and Evolution and Department of Biological Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough, Toronto, ON M1C 1A4, Canada.*

⁵*Department of Biology, Washington University in Saint Louis, St. Louis, MO 63130-4899, USA.*

***Author for correspondence:** c.cooney@sheffield.ac.uk

Article type: Letter

Running head: Sexual selection and speciation cycles in birds

Number of words in abstract: 149

Total number of words in main text: 4987

Number of figures: 2 (1 in Supplementary Information)

Number of tables: 2 (9 in Supplementary Information)

Number of references: 71

Author contributions: All authors developed the conceptual framework. C.R.C collected data and conducted the analyses. C.R.C., J.A.T. and N.S. wrote the manuscript, with input from all authors.

Data accessibility: Data will be made available via Dryad Digital Repository upon acceptance

Abstract

The role of sexual selection as a driver of speciation remains unresolved, not least because we lack a clear empirical understanding of its influence on different phases of the speciation process. Here, using data from 1306 recent avian speciation events, we show that plumage dichromatism (a proxy for sexual selection) does not predict diversification rates, but instead explains the rate at which young lineages achieve geographical range overlap. Importantly, this effect is only significant when range overlap is narrow (<20%). These findings are consistent with a 'differential fusion' model wherein sexual selection reduces rates of fusion among lineages undergoing secondary contact, facilitating parapatry or limited coexistence, whereas more extensive sympatry is contingent on additional factors such as ecological differentiation. Our results provide a more mechanistic explanation for why sexual selection appears to drive early stages of speciation while playing a seemingly limited role in determining broad-scale patterns of diversification.

Key-words: Differential fusion, plumage dichromatism, sexual selection, speciation, species coexistence, sympatry

Introduction

Speciation in animals is often viewed as a cyclical process beginning with divergence in allopatry and ending with coexistence in sympatry once the evolution of reproductive isolation permits the overlap of geographic ranges (Dobzhansky 1937; Mayr 1942). The concept of a 'speciation cycle' (Grant and Grant 2008; Price 2008) provides a unifying framework for understanding how lineage diversification gives rise to broad-scale patterns of species richness over space and time, first by generating new lineages with non-overlapping ranges, and second by regulating the capacity of such lineages to co-occur in ecological communities. The rates at which these stages of the cycle are completed are fundamental to the build-up of diversity and potentially influenced by a combination of ecology and sexual selection (Grant and Grant 2008; Price 2008). However, while the importance of ecology in driving or constraining speciation cycles is becoming increasingly well understood (e.g. Pigot and Tobias 2013; Price et al. 2014), the role of sexual selection remains unclear (Ritchie 2007; Kraaijeveld et al. 2011; Butlin et al. 2012).

Because of its propensity to stimulate the rapid evolution of phenotypic traits, sexual selection has long been recognised as a positive diversifying force (Darwin 1871; West-Eberhard 1983; Andersson 1994; Panhuis et al. 2001). In particular, by driving the evolution of traits involved in mate choice and species recognition (Lande 1981; Seddon et al. 2013), sexual selection could accelerate progression through stages of the speciation cycle, firstly by generating substantial reproductive isolation between lineages diverging in allopatry (Price 1998; Panhuis et al. 2001), and secondly by maintaining and/or strengthening isolating barriers when species ranges expand into sympatry (Gröning and Hochkirch 2008; Hudson and Price 2014; Weber and Strauss 2016). Despite these expectations, empirical support for a general coupling between sexual selection and diversification rates is surprisingly weak, and highly inconsistent both within and among taxonomic groups (Kraaijeveld et al. 2011). For instance, most comparative work has focused on birds, where the correlation between proxies of sexual selection and speciation rates are sometimes positive (Barraclough et al. 1995; Owens et al. 1999; Seddon et al. 2008) but just as often not (Morrow et al. 2003; Phillimore et al. 2006; Huang and Rabosky 2014).

Compared with rates of speciation, the connection between sexual selection and the establishment of geographic range overlap has received far less attention. This is partly because sexual selection (in isolation) seems unlikely to facilitate substantial range overlap because it tends to produce allospecies with divergent mating signals yet similar morphology, leaving in place the ecological barriers to co-existence associated with niche similarity and interspecific competition (Price 1998). However, an alternative view is that sexual selection may accelerate the initial establishment of range overlap by maintaining and/or strengthening reproductive isolation, thereby allowing young lineages to avoid 'fusion' following secondary contact (Noor 1999). Indeed, theoretical studies (e.g. van Doorn et al. 2009; M'Gonigle et al. 2012) suggest

that sexual selection may play a general role in reducing the costs associated with reproductive interference (Gröning and Hochkirch 2008; Weber and Strauss 2016) thus facilitating more extensive sympatry between young lineages. However, direct comparative tests of these ideas are lacking, and the extent to which sexual selection promotes (or impedes) range overlap among species is unknown (Price 2008).

Uncertainty over the role of sexual selection in speciation processes is also exacerbated by the variable results generated by different methodological approaches. For instance, studies testing the link between sexual selection and diversification using comparisons among deeper (i.e. older) phylogenetic nodes, such as those between genera and families, tend to yield weaker effects (Kraaijeveld et al. 2011). This suggests that the signature of sexual selection in diversification processes may fade over time (Kraaijeveld et al. 2011), possibly due to the confounding effect of extinction over longer evolutionary timescales (Rabosky 2010) and/or fluctuations in the strength of sexual selection as clade diversification progresses (Wiens 2001; Badyaev and Hill 2003; Price and Eaton 2014). Regardless of the underlying explanation, it seems plausible that clade-based studies comparing across deep timescales (e.g. Morrow et al. 2003; Phillimore et al. 2006; Huang and Rabosky 2014) may underestimate the role of sexual selection in speciation (Kraaijeveld et al. 2011).

To address these issues, we estimated the association between sexual selection and speciation processes across a global sample of avian sister species, representing the most recent divergence events culminating in full species. By focusing only on sister species (pairs of lineages which are each other's closest extant relatives), our approach minimises the difficulties associated with inferring the geographic, phenotypic, and evolutionary history of taxa descended from deeper phylogenetic nodes (Losos 2011), and maximises the power to detect an accurate signal of sexual selection on speciation (Seddon et al. 2013). Using two independent datasets, we employ phylogenetic modelling approaches (Weir and Schluter 2007; Pigot and Tobias 2013) to test the effects of sexual selection on both stages of the speciation cycle, first by studying links to rates of speciation (and extinction), and secondly by assessing the relationship between sexual selection and rates of transition from allopatry to sympatry.

If sexual selection accelerates the formation of new species (prediction 1), we expect sister pairs experiencing strong sexual selection to be associated with (i) more recent divergence times (i.e. younger evolutionary age), and (ii) faster rates of speciation. Similarly, if sexual selection plays an important role in facilitating range overlap among close relatives, we expect sister pairs experiencing strong sexual selection to be associated with (i) accelerated rates of transition from allopatric to parapatric/sympatric distributions, and (ii) for this effect to remain after accounting for other potentially important factors (e.g. geographical realm, latitude, body size, dispersal). Birds provide an ideal system in which to conduct these tests as they are a well-studied group with comprehensive data on phylogeny, ecology and biogeography, and

because avian plumage dichromatism—the difference in colouration of males and females of the same species—is a relatively robust and commonly used proxy for the degree of sexual selection (Owens and Hartley 1998; Dunn et al. 2001; Dale et al. 2015; Dunn et al. 2015).

Materials and methods

SISTER SPECIES DATASETS

We generated two datasets of avian sister species pairs. First, we assembled a dataset of passerine sister pairs for which we could collect detailed data on dichromatism using spectrophotometric measurements of plumage colouration from museum specimens. Second, we used the Jetz et al. (2012) time-calibrated phylogenies combined with human (visual) scores of dichromatism to provide data for a larger set of sister pairs sampled from across the avian radiation. The resulting datasets contained 144 and 1306 sister pairs, respectively, and are referred to throughout as dataset 1 and dataset 2, respectively. See Appendix S1 for full details of methods, data and data sources.

QUANTIFYING SEXUAL DICHROMATISM

We quantified sexual dichromatism in two ways. First, for the 144 pairs of passerine bird species in dataset 1, we measured sexual dichromatism objectively using measurements of plumage colour collected using a spectrophotometer. Second, as it was not feasible to obtain spectrophotometric measures of plumage colour for thousands of species, for all the species in dataset 2, including replicate trees (total species = 5681; see Appendix S1), we scored sexual dichromatism from handbook illustrations (del Hoyo et al. 1992–2011). In both cases, a low dichromatism score indicates similar colouration in both sexes (monochromatism) with higher values indicating greater degree of dichromatism. See Appendix S1 for full details of the methods used to quantify dichromatism.

A key assumption underlying our analyses is that sexual dichromatism is a valid proxy for the intensity of sexual selection in birds. Evidence supporting this comes from a number of broad-scale studies that reveal strong positive relationships between dichromatism and other indices of sexual selection such as testes size, the degree of polygyny and the frequency of extra-pair paternity (Owens and Hartley 1998; Dunn et al. 2001; Dale et al. 2015; Dunn et al. 2015). As a consequence, dichromatism is widely used as a standard proxy for sexual selection in birds (e.g. Barraclough et al. 1995; Owens et al. 1999; Morrow et al. 2003; Sol et al. 2005; Phillimore et al. 2006; Krüger 2008; Seddon et al. 2008; Bloch 2015), as well as other taxa including lizards (e.g. Stuart-Fox and Owens 2003), insects (e.g. Misof 2002) and fish (e.g. Wagner et al. 2012). We note, however, that the use of sexual dichromatism as a proxy for sexual selection is subject to a number of important caveats. For example, sexual dichromatism and sexual selection are likely to be only partially correlated, not least because other

mechanisms can influence patterns of sex-differences in plumage colouration, such as natural selection for female crypsis in species with female-only incubation (Badyaev and Hill 2003) or social selection on females to signal quality in the context of male mate choice or female-female competition (Tobias et al. 2012). In addition, sexual dichromatism may only provide a lower bound estimate of the overall intensity of sexual selection. This is because of potential trade-offs between signalling modalities (Darwin 1871), where investment in one signalling modality (e.g. visual signals) constrains elaboration in another (e.g. acoustic signals). While it would therefore be preferable to compare direct measures of sexual selection from detailed studies of behaviour or reproduction, these estimates are lacking for large numbers of species. Thus, we conclude that dichromatism is the best proxy currently available for the purposes of broad-scale comparative analyses, and also that our analysis is likely to underestimate the effects of sexual selection on rates of diversification and range overlap, rather than exaggerate them.

QUANTIFYING RANGE OVERLAP

Sister pairs were assigned to range overlap categories based on current spatial overlap of species breeding distributions. To quantify range overlap we used range map polygons provided by BirdLife International and NatureServe (2015) and calculated percentage range overlap within sister pairs as the area of overlap between species divided by the area of the smaller species' range (Pigot and Tobias 2013; Tobias et al. 2014; Pigot and Tobias 2015; Pigot et al. 2016). We then used these values to assign sister pairs to range overlap categories using two different approaches. Following previous studies (Pigot and Tobias 2013, 2015; Pigot et al. 2016), pairs were initially categorized as either allopatric or sympatric under a range of overlap thresholds to define sympatry (>0%, >5%, >10%, >20%, >30%, >40%, >50%, >60%, >70%, >80%). As results based on this approach suggested that dichromatism was primarily correlated with instances of moderate but not substantial range overlap (see below), we then employed a second approach by introducing a third category (parapatry) to distinguish instances of narrow (<20%) range overlap between species that are distinct from cases of more extensive, range-wide sympatry. In this second approach, we categorized pairs as either allopatric, parapatric or sympatric using three alternative combinations of overlap thresholds to define allopatry (<0%, <5%, <10%), parapatry (>0-20%, >5-25%, >10-30%) and sympatry (>20%, >25%, >30%). We note that one additional benefit of considering increasingly stringent definitions of parapatry/sympatry is that we were able to control for the possibility that erroneous overlap estimates caused by mapping errors (Hurlbert and Jetz 2007) could influence our results. In total, we quantified levels of range overlap for 140 (97%) in dataset 1, and 1306 (100%) pairs in dataset 2 (Fig. S1).

ADDITIONAL PREDICTORS OF SYMPATRY RATE

Several factors have the potential to confound tests of the link between sexual selection and sympatry through shared correlations with plumage dichromatism and sympatry rate. For instance, dichromatism has been linked to high breeding latitude, migratory behavior and territoriality (Badyaev and Hill 2003; Tobias et al. 2012) and all three variables are known to correlate with sympatry rate in birds, presumably through their associations with organism vagility (Weir and Price 2011; Pigot and Tobias 2015). Similarly, body size correlates with plumage dichromatism in passerines (Dale et al. 2015) and could also influence sympatry rate through correlated effects on dispersal ability, range size and habitat partitioning. Furthermore, at very broad scales, tests of the link between sexual selection and sympatry rate could also be hampered by idiosyncratic differences among taxonomic groups (Huang and Rabosky 2014) or geographic regions (Pigot et al. 2016). Thus, in addition to plumage dichromatism, we also quantified (i) latitude, (ii) level of migratory behaviour, (iii) level of territoriality, (iv) body size, (v) taxonomy (non-passerine/passerine) and (vi) geographic region, for each sister pair in dataset 2 (see Appendix S1). To aid comparison of effect sizes, all continuous variables were centered and rescaled prior to analysis.

ESTIMATING RATES OF SPECIATION AND EXTINCTION

To assess the link between sexual selection and rates of speciation and extinction, we fitted a set of birth-death models to our datasets of sister pair ages (Weir and Schluter 2007; Seddon et al. 2013). In these models, observed sister pair ages are compared to probability distributions of sister pair ages generated by simulating a large number of phylogenetic trees under a range of different values of speciation and extinction rate. Each parameter combination produces a distribution with a unique mean and shape—where the phylogenetic signals of the speciation and extinction rates are contained in the mean and shape of the distribution, respectively—making it possible to estimate recent rates of speciation and extinction using only information for extant species (Weir and Schluter 2007). In our models, rates of speciation and extinction were allowed to vary linearly with increasing extent of sexual dichromatism, and the approach estimated the combination of speciation rates, extinction rates and lag-time to species recognition most likely to yield the distribution of species' ages observed in the sample. The lag time adjustment prunes out nodes from phylogenetic trees if they are younger than a focal lag time drawn at random from an exponential distribution and is intended to correct for the fact that empirical phylogenies typically lack nodes representing intraspecific splits between taxa not currently recognised as separate species. Probability distributions of sister pair ages were simulated under a birth-death model using a wide range of parameter values (see Appendix S1).

We compared the fit of a two-parameter model in which all sister pairs had a single rate of speciation and extinction, to models that allowed speciation rate and/or extinction rate to change linearly with increasing dichromatism (i.e. three or four parameter models with one or

two slopes and two intercepts, respectively). All models estimated a single lag time parameter (i.e. one additional parameter), which for simplicity was assumed not to vary with increasing sexual dichromatism (Seddon et al. 2013). To infer the significance of slope estimates we used likelihood ratio tests (LRTs) and ΔAICc scores interpreted with reference to the results of simulations tests designed to control for elevated rates of Type I error (see below). To provide an alternative test of the link between sexual dichromatism and diversification, we also used PGLS models (implemented in the 'caper' R package; Orme et al. 2013) to assess the raw relationship between dichromatism and sister pair age.

ESTIMATING RATES OF PARAPATRY/SYMPATRY

To test the link between sexual selection and rates of geographic range overlap, we used a modeling approach based on continuous time multi-state Markov models (Pigot and Tobias 2013, 2015; Pigot et al. 2016). In this approach, each sister pair contributes two observations: the geographic state at the time of population divergence and that of the present day. Here we assume that sister species originated in allopatry (first observation) based on substantial evidence that allopatric speciation is the predominant mode of speciation across all organisms (Coyne and Orr 2004) and especially for birds (Phillimore et al. 2008; Price 2008). We considered two model types with alternative sets of possible states for present day distributions. In the first, pairs could take one of two possible secondary states, either allopatric and sympatric. In the second this was extended to three possible secondary states, either allopatric, parapatric or sympatric (see above). Separately for both datasets 1 and 2, we used maximum likelihood to estimate the rate (per million years; [Myr]) at which species pairs transition from either allopatry to sympatry (model 1) or allopatry to parapatry and parapatry to sympatry (model 2). For simplicity, we modelled this as a one-way process in which transitions from allopatry to sympatry (via parapatry) are irreversible. A detailed description of the modeling approach can be found in (Pigot and Tobias 2013).

We compared the fit of constant-rate models, in which the transition rates are equal across species pairs (accounting for age), to variable-rate models that allow sympatry rate to vary in accordance with one or more covariates. The significance of any co-variation between dichromatism and transition rates was assessed using ΔAICc scores interpreted with reference to the results of simulations tests (see below). All models were implemented in R using the *msm* library (Jackson 2011).

SIMULATION TESTS

The statistical significance of parameter estimates may be overestimated if models are biased towards the inference of 'false positives' (i.e. have inflated Type I error rates). To determine when our null (i.e. constant-rate) models can be confidently rejected, we used the distribution of

$\Delta AICc$ values derived from fits to simulated datasets to identify critical values required to maintain a Type I error rate of $\alpha = 0.05$ (Rabosky 2006; Lawson and Weir 2014). We simulated 100 null datasets for each dichromatism dataset using BM models of trait evolution fit to pair-level trees, and then tested both constant- and variable-rate models. By simulating data under the null hypothesis of rate-constancy, we can confidently reject the constant-rate model (with a Type I error rate ≤ 0.05) if the $\Delta AICc$ for a particular parameter is greater than the appropriate critical value (Rabosky 2006). Critical values correspond to the 95th percentile of the null $\Delta AICc$ distribution and values vary depending on the model and parameter in question (Table S2).

Results

SEXUAL SELECTION AND RECENT RATES OF SPECIATION AND EXTINCTION

Using the observed distributions of sister pair ages in our datasets (Fig. 1), we fitted models estimating the relationship between speciation and extinction rates and sexual dichromatism. In dataset 1, based on spectrophotometric measurements of dichromatism ($n = 144$ pairs; Fig. S1a), the full model estimated a positive slope between speciation rate and dichromatism (Table 1). Likewise, in dataset 2, based on human scores of dichromatism ($n = 1306$ pairs; Fig. S1b), the full model also estimated a positive slope between speciation rate and dichromatism (Table 1). However, support for variable rates of speciation was lower than the corresponding critical $\Delta AICc$ values for both datasets (see Table S2), meaning the null hypothesis of equal speciation rates across the dichromatism gradient could not be rejected. Similarly, in terms of extinction, we also found little evidence that extinction rates vary significantly in line with dichromatism in either of our datasets (Table 1). Analyses based on 100 replicate trees produced comparable results (Table S3). The conclusion of minimal differences in diversification rates among monochromatic and dichromatic species is further supported by the observation that sister pair age was uncorrelated with levels of dichromatism in both data cases (Fig. 1, Table S4). Thus, overall we found little support for the idea that sexual selection significantly elevates rates of lineage formation.

RATES OF TRANSITION INTO PARAPATRY/SYMPATRY

In support of the hypothesis that sexual selection facilitates secondary contact between closely related bird species, we found positive associations between dichromatism and the rate at which sister species achieve geographic range overlap. First, by categorizing pairs as either allopatric or sympatric, we found robust support for positive associations between dichromatism and sympatry rate in both dataset 1 and 2 when using relaxed definitions of sympatry (i.e. range overlap thresholds 0-20%; Table S5). However, under more stringent definitions of sympatry (i.e. range overlap thresholds 30-80%), there were no significant associations between dichromatism and the rate at which sister pairs achieve sympatry (Table S5). Second, using an alternative

approach in which pairs were categorized as allopatric, parapatric or sympatric, we found robust support in both datasets 1 and 2 for a positive relationship between dichromatism and the rate at which sister species achieve narrow (i.e. parapatric) but not extensive (i.e. sympatric) geographic range overlap (Table 2; Fig. 2). Dichromatic sister species are inferred to become parapatric 2-4 times faster than monochromatic sisters (Table 2, Fig. 2a,c). In contrast, dichromatism did not significantly predict the rate at which sister species transition from parapatric distributions to more extensive levels of sympatry (Table 2, Fig. 2b,d). In all cases, results were similar when we re-ran our analyses on 100 replicate trees (Table S6 and S7).

Furthermore, focusing on dataset 2, we found that the positive association between dichromatism and fast transitions to (narrow) geographic range overlap could not be explained by correlations with potentially confounding variables. Based on relaxed definitions of sympatry (i.e. <20% overlap = sympatry), we found strong evidence for associations between territoriality, body mass and geographical realm in explaining sympatry rates across birds (Table S8), suggesting that differences in levels of competition and dispersal ability among species, and/or niche availability within biomes, contributes to explaining variation in sympatry rate among bird species. Yet, none of these effects accounted for the significant association between sympatry rate and dichromatism (Table S8). Likewise, distinguishing between transitions from allopatry to parapatry, and parapatry to sympatry, we found comparable results: dichromatism remained an important predictor of transition rates to parapatry but not sympatry (Table S9).

Discussion

Using plumage dichromatism as a proxy for the intensity of sexual selection, we tested two separate hypotheses linking sexual selection to the outcome of speciation cycles in birds. Our results reveal that, even when focusing on recent speciation events (i.e. sister species), there is little evidence linking variation in levels of plumage dichromatism to differences in divergence times or rates of speciation (and extinction) across lineages. However, sexual selection had a significant role in facilitating the early stages of range overlap between close relatives. These findings suggest that sexual selection plays a limited role in driving diversification rates, even within recently diverged taxa, but can help to explain transitions to stable secondary contact.

The lack of a significant positive association between sexual selection and speciation rates across avian sister pairs corroborates the findings of previous studies testing this relationship in taxa descended from deeper phylogenetic nodes (Morrow et al. 2003; Phillimore et al. 2006; Huang and Rabosky 2014). In these previous studies, the failure to detect a signature of sexual selection may have occurred simply because the analyses focused on longer evolutionary timescales. For instance, if extinction were biased towards sexually selected taxa, many of the speciation events generated by sexual selection would be lost over time, thus becoming harder to detect in comparisons among older extant lineages (Kraaijeveld et al. 2011).

Similarly, the intensity of sexual selection likely fluctuates over time (Wiens 2001) and thus there may be a disconnect between present day levels of selection (as measured through our dichromatism scores) and those occurring during the speciation processes that initially gave rise to the study lineages. Such disconnects almost certainly increase in scale and frequency over time since speciation, meaning that the inclusion of deeper phylogenetic nodes may increase uncertainty and thus mask any effect of sexual selection on the speciation process. Thus, although it has become increasingly clear that no ‘universal’ relationship between sexual selection and speciation rate exists at the scale of higher taxa (e.g. genera and families), previous comparative studies left open the possibility that sexual selection is a stronger driver of speciation in recently diverged taxa (Kraaijeveld et al. 2011). Our study addresses this question directly, and yet we still find no relationship between sexual selection and recent speciation rates estimated from avian sister pairs. This finding supports the growing consensus that, for birds at least, sexual selection plays a limited role in driving diversification irrespective of evolutionary timescale (Huang and Rabosky 2014).

The weak association between sexual selection and speciation rates at the level of sister species has several potential explanations. One is that the effect of sexual selection on diversification may produce phenotypically divergent but short-lived ‘ephemeral species’ (Rosenblum et al. 2012) that are difficult to detect empirically. However, this seems unlikely given that new species are often described on the basis of differences in sexually selected traits (Ritchie 2007). An alternative explanation is that the rate at which new species form is more strongly controlled by other factors besides sexual selection, including the rate of ecological or genetic differentiation (Sobel et al. 2010), and thus that sexual selection plays a limited role in driving the evolution of new species (Price 1998; Servedio and Bürger 2014). It can be argued, for example, that sexual selection is episodic and highly contingent on other factors, such as resource availability and local changes in population density or predation risk (e.g. Irwin 2000; Johnson and Lanyon 2000), thus weakening its effects on diversification and longer-term evolutionary change. Finally—and perhaps more plausibly—if sexual selection contributes to the evolution of reproductive isolation, it seems likely to do so in allopatry/parapatry without giving rise to the type of differences that facilitate coexistence in sympatry, thus delaying the completion of speciation cycles.

We tested this possibility by assessing whether sexual selection was associated with rates of transition to sympatry or merely to parapatry, finding strong support for the hypothesis that sexual selection plays a role in shaping patterns of geographic range overlap in birds. Specifically, we found that dichromatism was positively correlated with the rate at which sister species became parapatric (i.e. only narrowly sympatric), such that highly dichromatic sister pairs achieved parapatry 2-4 times faster than more monochromatic sister pairs. This positive effect on range overlap rate was consistent across two independent dichromatism datasets that

384 differed in taxonomic scope and the method used to quantify dichromatism. Although this
385 relationship has not previously been directly assessed, compatible findings have been reported
386 in particular avian clades, including the waterfowl (Anseriformes) and New World warblers
387 (Parulidae), where dichromatism (and bright male plumage) is associated with increased
388 sympatric diversity among closely related species (Figuerola and Green 2000; Pfennig and
389 Hurlbert 2012). An alternative possibility is that dichromatism (our proxy for sexual selection) co-
390 varies with a variety of ecological, behavioural and biogeographic factors (Badyaev and Hill
391 2003; Dale et al. 2015; Dunn et al. 2015), many of which could explain correlations between
392 dichromatism and rates of range overlap. However, we found no support for this idea when we
393 included a suite of such variables (latitude, migration, territoriality, body size and geographic
394 realm) in our models, as none explained the key association. We conclude that the link between
395 dichromatism and rates of achieving parapatry is not attributable to shared correlations with
396 confounding factors.

397 A positive correlation between dichromatism and rates of achieving narrow range overlap
398 may arise because sexual selection reduces the likelihood of young lineages collapsing back
399 into single species following the onset of secondary contact. Termed ‘differential fusion’, this
400 hypothesis predicts that only species with strong mating discrimination (i.e. pre-mating isolation)
401 persist after secondary contact, while populations lacking such discrimination frequently fuse
402 through hybridisation and gene flow (Noor 1999). Differential fusion does not necessarily rely on
403 sexual selection influencing the underlying rate at which lineages come into contact, but merely
404 accelerating the evolution of traits important for pre-mating isolation (Seddon et al. 2013) and
405 thus increasing the likelihood of remaining distinct following secondary contact (Edwards et al.
406 2005; Hudson and Price 2014). The pattern we detect of reduced average waiting times to
407 parapatry in dichromatic lineages may therefore be produced by elevated rates of fusion in
408 young monochromatic lineages after secondary contact. Coyne and Orr (1989) argued against
409 the importance of differential fusion for understanding speciation in *Drosophila*, but recent work
410 examining patterns of mating signal divergence and range overlap in birds (Martin et al. 2010;
411 Delmore et al. 2015; Martin et al. 2015) suggests that differential fusion may play a more
412 important role than currently appreciated.

413 Differential fusion is relevant to secondary contact in parapatric lineages with narrow
414 range overlap, but wider spatial overlap between incipient lineages is theoretically less
415 dependent on reproductive isolation. In this case, our results clearly indicate that the positive
416 influence of sexual selection does not result in more extensive levels of sympatry. In particular,
417 we found that transition rates from allopatry (or parapatry) to more substantial levels of range
418 overlap (i.e. 30-80%) were unrelated to levels of dichromatism across pairs. The most likely
419 explanation for this pattern is that, while divergent sexual selection may generate sufficient
420 reproductive isolation between lineages to prevent complete fusion, sister species must still

overcome ecological barriers to sympatry, such as niche similarity and resource competition, which are likely to represent particularly important barriers to range expansions among close relatives (Pigot and Tobias 2013; Price et al. 2014). Thus, while sexual selection appears to promote the initial establishment of contact and minor overlap between species ranges, our results are consistent with the view that ecological rather than sexual interactions are more important in determining transitions to more extensive levels of species co-existence (Sobel et al. 2010).

Geographic range expansion is a necessary step for repeated rounds of speciation, and the large amount of time required to establish sympatry with close relatives likely places a severe limit on the rate of on-going speciation (Price 2008; Weir and Price 2011). By failing to facilitate transitions to extensive sympatry among sister species, sexual selection (in isolation) is unlikely to promote the type of large-scale range expansion required for repeated progression through the speciation cycle, especially within mature, species rich, continental radiations. Our findings therefore provide a novel explanation for the generally weak (or nonexistent) effect of sexual selection on speciation rates. By playing only a limited role in allowing lineages to overcome barriers to continued diversification imposed by competition with related species, sexual selection soon comes up against the constraints of ecological competition. Thus, the best opportunity for rapid and sustained species diversification is likely to occur in situations where ecological opportunity and sexual selection coincide (Wagner et al. 2012).

Taken together, our results add a further dimension to the well-established view that biotic interactions limit range expansion and species co-existence (MacArthur 1972; Diamond 1975) by providing comparative evidence that the initial stages of range overlap are likely to be constrained by fitness costs associated with sexual as well as ecological interactions between species (Gröning and Hochkirch 2008; Weber and Strauss 2016). Thus, while sexual selection may accelerate the establishment of (narrow) range overlap among sister species, it plays a more limited role in driving the formation of new lineages or promoting the type of large-scale range expansions required for repeated rounds of speciation. Our study therefore provides a more mechanistic explanation for the general observation that sexual selection (in isolation) plays a seemingly limited role in explaining broad-scale patterns of diversification (Kraaijeveld et al. 2011).

Acknowledgements

We thank the British Natural History Museum for access to specimens, P. Dunn and L. Whittingham for data, and Alex Pigot, Gavin Thomas and Trevor Price for helpful discussion and assistance with analyses. This research was supported by the Natural Environment Research Council (studentship to C.R.C.; grant NE/I028068/1 to J.A.T.), the Natural Sciences and

Engineering Research Council Discovery and Accelerator Programs (grants RGPIN-2016-0653 and 49289 to J.T.W.) and the Royal Society (University Research Fellowship to N.S.).

References

- Andersson, M. 1994. Sexual selection. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Badyaev, A. V. and G. E. Hill. 2003. Avian sexual dichromatism in relation to phylogeny and ecology. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 34:27-49.
- Barracough, T. G., P. H. Harvey, and S. Nee. 1995. Sexual selection and taxonomic diversity in passerine birds. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B* 259:211-215.
- Bloch, N. I. 2015. Evolution of opsin expression in birds driven by sexual selection and habitat. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B* 282:20142321.
- Butlin, R., A. DeBelle, C. Kerth, R. R. Snook, L. W. Beukeboom, R. F. Castillo Cajas, W. Diao, M. E. Maan, S. Paolucci, F. J. Weissing, L. van de Zande, A. Hoikkala, E. Geuverink, J. Jennings, M. Kankare, K. E. Knott, V. I. Tyukmaeva, C. Zoumadakis, M. G. Ritchie, D. Barker, E. Immonen, M. Kirkpatrick, M. Noor, C. Macias Garcia, T. Schmitt, and M. Schilthuizen. 2012. What do we need to know about speciation? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 27:27-39.
- Coyne, J. A. and H. A. Orr. 2004. Speciation. Sinauer, Sunderland, MA.
- Dale, J., C. J. Dey, K. Delhey, B. Kempnaers, and M. Valcu. 2015. The effects of life history and sexual selection on male and female plumage colouration. *Nature* 527:367-370.
- Darwin, C. R. 1871. The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex. John Murray, London, UK.
- del Hoyo, J., A. Elliott, J. Sargatal, and D. A. Christe. 1992–2011. The Handbook of the Birds of the World, vols 1-16. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.
- Delmore, K. E., H. L. Kenyon, R. R. Germain, and D. E. Irwin. 2015. Phenotypic divergence during speciation is inversely associated with differences in seasonal migration. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B* 282:20151921.
- Diamond, J. M. 1975. Assembly of species communities *in* M. L. Cody, and J. M. Diamond, eds. *Ecology and Evolution of Communities*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Dobzhansky, T. 1937. Genetics and the origin of species. Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- Dunn, P. O., J. K. Armenta, and L. A. Whittingham. 2015. Natural and sexual selection act on different axes of variation in avian plumage color. *Science Advances* 1:e1400155.
- Dunn, P. O., L. A. Whittingham, and T. E. Pitcher. 2001. Mating systems, sperm competition, and the evolution of sexual dimorphism in birds. *Evolution* 55:161-175.
- Edwards, S. V., S. B. Kingan, J. D. Calkins, C. N. Balakrishnan, W. B. Jennings, W. J. Swanson, and M. D. Sorenson. 2005. Speciation in birds: genes, geography, and sexual selection. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 102:6550-6557.
- Figuerola, J. and A. J. Green. 2000. The evolution of sexual dimorphism in relation to mating patterns, cavity nesting, insularity and sympatry in the Anseriformes. *Funct. Ecol.* 14:701-710.
- Grant, P. R. and B. R. Grant. 2008. How and why species multiply: the radiation of Darwin's finches. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Gröning, J. and A. Hochkirch. 2008. Reproductive interference between animal species. *Q. Rev. Biol.* 83:257-282.
- Huang, H. and D. L. Rabosky. 2014. Sexual selection and diversification: reexamining the correlation between dichromatism and speciation rate in birds. *Am. Nat.* 184:E101-E114.
- Hudson, E. J. and T. D. Price. 2014. Pervasive reinforcement and the role of sexual selection in biological speciation. *J. Hered.* 105:821-833.
- Hurlbert, A. H. and W. Jetz. 2007. Species richness, hotspots, and the scale dependence of range maps in ecology and conservation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 104:13384-13389.
- Irwin, D. E. 2000. Song variation in an avian ring species. *Evolution* 54:998-1010.
- Jackson, C. H. 2011. Multi-state models for panel data: the msm package for R. *Journal of Statistical Software* 38:1-28.

508 Jetz, W., G. H. Thomas, J. B. Joy, K. Hartmann, and A. O. Mooers. 2012. The global diversity of birds in
509 space and time. *Nature* 491:444-448.

510 Johnson, K. P. and S. M. Lanyon. 2000. Evolutionary changes in color patches of blackbirds are
511 associated with marsh nesting. *Behav. Ecol.* 11:515-519.

512 Kraaijeveld, K., F. J. L. Kraaijeveld-Smit, and M. E. Maan. 2011. Sexual selection and speciation: the
513 comparative evidence revisited. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* 86:367-377.

514 Krüger, O. 2008. Engines of speciation: a comparative study in birds of prey. *J. Evol. Biol.* 21:861-
515 872.

516 Lande, R. 1981. Models of speciation by sexual selection on polygenic traits. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
517 U.S.A. 78:3721-3725.

518 Lawson, A. M. and J. T. Weir. 2014. Latitudinal gradients in climatic-niche evolution accelerate trait
519 evolution at high latitudes. *Ecol. Lett.* 17:1427-1436.

520 Losos, J. B. 2011. Seeing the forest for the trees: the limitations of phylogenies in comparative
521 biology. *Am. Nat.* 177:709-727.

522 M'Gonigle, L. K., R. Mazzucco, S. P. Otto, and U. Dieckmann. 2012. Sexual selection enables long-term
523 coexistence despite ecological equivalence. *Nature* 484:506-509.

524 MacArthur, R. H. 1972. *Geographical ecology: patterns in the distributions of species.* Harper and
525 Row, New York, NY.

526 Martin, P. R., R. Montgomerie, and S. C. Loughheed. 2010. Rapid sympatry explains greater color
527 pattern divergence in high latitude birds. *Evolution* 64:336-347.

528 Martin, P. R., R. Montgomerie, and S. C. Loughheed. 2015. Color patterns of closely related bird species
529 are more divergent at intermediate levels of breeding-range sympatry. *Am. Nat.* 185:443-
530 451.

531 Mayr, E. 1942. *Systematics and the origin of species.* Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.

532 Misof, B. 2002. Diversity of Anisoptera (Odonata): inferring speciation processes from patterns of
533 morphological diversity. *Zoology* 105:355-365.

534 Morrow, E. H., T. E. Pitcher, and G. Arnqvist. 2003. No evidence that sexual selection is an 'engine of
535 speciation' in birds. *Ecol. Lett.* 6:228-234.

536 Noor, M. A. F. 1999. Reinforcement and other consequences of sympatry. *Heredity* 83:503-508.

537 Orme, C. D. L., R. P. Freckleton, G. H. Thomas, T. Petzoldt, S. A. Fritz, N. Isaac, and W. D. Pearse. 2013.
538 Caper: comparative analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R. R package version 0.5.2.
539 <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=caper>.

540 Owens, I. P. F., P. M. Bennett, and P. H. Harvey. 1999. Species richness among birds: body size, life
541 history, sexual selection or ecology? *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B* 266:933-939.

542 Owens, I. P. F. and I. R. Hartley. 1998. Sexual dimorphism in birds: why are there so many different
543 forms of dimorphism? *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B* 265:397-407.

544 Panhuis, T. M., R. Butlin, M. Zuk, and T. Tregenza. 2001. Sexual selection and speciation. *Trends Ecol.*
545 *Evol.* 16:364-371.

546 Pfennig, K. S. and A. H. Hurlbert. 2012. Heterospecific interactions and the proliferation of sexually
547 dimorphic traits. *Current Zoology* 58:453-462.

548 Phillimore, A. B., R. P. Freckleton, C. D. L. Orme, and I. P. F. Owens. 2006. Ecology predicts large-scale
549 patterns of phylogenetic diversification in birds. *Am. Nat.* 168:220-229.

550 Phillimore, A. B., C. D. L. Orme, G. H. Thomas, T. M. Blackburn, P. M. Bennett, K. J. Gaston, and I. P. F.
551 Owens. 2008. Sympatric speciation in birds is rare: insights from range data and
552 simulations. *Am. Nat.* 171:646-657.

553 Pigot, A. L. and J. A. Tobias. 2013. Species interactions constrain geographic range expansion over
554 evolutionary time. *Ecol. Lett.* 16:330-338.

555 Pigot, A. L. and J. A. Tobias. 2015. Dispersal and the transition to sympatry in vertebrates. *Proc. R.*
556 *Soc. London Ser. B* 282:20141929.

557 Pigot, A. L., J. A. Tobias, and W. Jetz. 2016. Energetic constraints on species coexistence in birds. *PLoS*
558 *Biol.* 14:e1002407.

559 Price, J. J. and M. D. Eaton. 2014. Reconstructing the evolution of sexual dichromatism: current color
560 diversity does not reflect past rates of male and female change. *Evolution* 68:2026-2037.

- Price, T. 1998. Sexual selection and natural selection in bird speciation. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London Ser. B* 353:251-260.
- Price, T. D. 2008. Speciation in birds. Roberts and Co., Greenwood Village, CO.
- Price, T. D., D. M. Hooper, C. D. Buchanan, U. S. Johansson, D. T. Tietze, P. Alström, U. Olsson, M. Ghosh-Harihar, F. Ishtiaq, S. K. Gupta, J. Martens, B. Harr, P. Singh, and D. Mohan. 2014. Niche filling slows the diversification of Himalayan songbirds. *Nature* 509:222-225.
- Rabosky, D. L. 2006. Likelihood methods for detecting temporal shifts in diversification rates. *Evolution* 60:1152-1164.
- Rabosky, D. L. 2010. Extinction rates should not be estimated from molecular phylogenies. *Evolution* 64:1816-1824.
- Ritchie, M. G. 2007. Sexual selection and speciation. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 38:79-102.
- Rosenblum, E. B., B. A. J. Sarver, J. W. Brown, S. Des Roches, K. M. Hardwick, T. D. Hether, J. M. Eastman, M. W. Pennell, and L. J. Harmon. 2012. Goldilocks meets Santa Rosalia: an ephemeral speciation model explains patterns of diversification across time scales. *Evolutionary Biology* 39:255-261.
- Seddon, N., C. A. Botero, J. A. Tobias, P. O. Dunn, H. E. Macgregor, D. R. Rubenstein, J. A. Uy, J. T. Weir, L. A. Whittingham, and R. J. Safran. 2013. Sexual selection accelerates signal evolution during speciation in birds. *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B* 280:20131065.
- Seddon, N., R. M. Merrill, and J. A. Tobias. 2008. Sexually selected traits predict patterns of species richness in a diverse clade of suboscine birds. *Am. Nat.* 171:620-631.
- Servedio, M. R. and R. Bürger. 2014. The counterintuitive role of sexual selection in species maintenance and speciation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 111:8113-8118.
- Sobel, J. M., G. F. Chen, L. R. Watt, and D. W. Schemske. 2010. The biology of speciation. *Evolution* 64:295-315.
- Sol, D., D. G. Stirling, and L. Lefebvre. 2005. Behavioural drive or behavioural inhibition in evolution: subspecific diversification in Holarctic passerines. *Evolution* 59:2669-2677.
- Stuart-Fox, D. and I. P. F. Owens. 2003. Species richness in agamid lizards: chance, body size, sexual selection or ecology? *J. Evol. Biol.* 16:659-669.
- Tobias, J. A., C. K. Cornwallis, E. P. Derryberry, S. Claramunt, R. T. Brumfield, and N. Seddon. 2014. Species coexistence and the dynamics of phenotypic evolution in adaptive radiation. *Nature* 506:359-363.
- Tobias, J. A., R. Montgomerie, and B. E. Lyon. 2012. The evolution of female ornaments and weaponry: social selection, sexual selection and ecological competition. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London Ser. B* 367:2274-2293.
- van Doorn, G. S., P. Edelaar, and F. J. Weissing. 2009. On the origin of species by natural and sexual selection. *Science* 326:1704-1707.
- Wagner, C. E., L. J. Harmon, and O. Seehausen. 2012. Ecological opportunity and sexual selection together predict adaptive radiation. *Nature* 487:366-370.
- Weber, M. G. and S. Y. Strauss. 2016. Coexistence in close relatives: beyond competition and reproductive isolation in sister taxa. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 47:359-381.
- Weir, J. T. and T. D. Price. 2011. Limits to speciation inferred from times to secondary sympatry and ages of hybridizing species along a latitudinal gradient. *Am. Nat.* 177:462-469.
- Weir, J. T. and D. Schluter. 2007. The latitudinal gradient in recent speciation and extinction rates of birds and mammals. *Science* 315:1574-1576.
- West-Eberhard, M. J. 1983. Sexual selection, social competition, and speciation. *Q. Rev. Biol.* 58:155-183.
- Wiens, J. J. 2001. Widespread loss of sexually selected traits: how the peacock lost its spots. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 16:517-523.

611 **Supporting information**

612

613 Additional supporting information may be found in Appendix S1:

614

615 Includes supplementary methods, figures (S1) and tables (S1-S9).

616

617

Figure and table captions

Figure 1. The relationship between pair age and sexual dichromatism across avian sister pairs based on (a) spectrophotometric and (b) human estimates of dichromatism (n = 144 pairs in dataset 1, and 1306 pairs in dataset 2, respectively).

Figure 2. The effect of dichromatism on rates of transition from allopatry to parapatry (a,c) and parapatry to sympatry (b,d) based on spectrophotometric (a,b) and visual (c,d) estimates of dichromatism in avian sister pairs (n = 140 pairs in dataset 1, and 1306 pairs in dataset 2, respectively). Plotted rate estimates are mean values (solid line) with 95% confidence intervals (grey shading) using range overlap thresholds of <5%, 5-25% and >25% to categorise species as allopatric, parapatric and sympatric, respectively. Asterisks (*) denote significant ($\alpha = 0.05$) effects (see Table S2).

Table 1. Estimates of speciation and extinction rates across gradients of increasing sexual dichromatism.

Table 2. Models of the relationship between parapatry and sympatry rate and sexual dichromatism across sister pairs of birds using alternative range overlap thresholds to assign parapatry and sympatry.

Supplementary figure and table captions

Figure S1. Plot showing the variation in evolutionary age, extent of range overlap and level of sexual dichromatism across avian sister species pairs with respect to the underlying phylogeny. In (a) dichromatism is estimated for a set of passerine sister pairs using spectrophotometric measurements of plumage (dataset 1; n = 144 species pairs), whereas in (b) estimates are based on human scores of dichromatism for a broader sample of passerine and non-passerine pairs (dataset 2; n = 1306 species pairs).

Table S1. Principal component (PC) loadings and importance values for reflectance measurements of plumage colour (n = 61920) collapsed into 20nm bins.

Table S2. Critical $\Delta AICc$ values for models testing the association between diversification and parapatry/sympatry rates and dichromatism across alternative sister pair datasets.

Table S3. Median parameter values of speciation and extinction rates across gradients of increasing sexual dichromatism estimated using datasets of avian sister pairs (n = 1283 – 1321) sampled from 100 posterior trees.

Table S4. PGLS models of the relationship between age and sexual dichromatism across avian sister pairs.

Table S5. Models of the relationship between sympatry rate and sexual dichromatism across sister pairs of birds under alternative range overlap thresholds used to assign sympatry.

Table S6. Median parameter values for the relationship between sympatry rate and sexual dichromatism (under alternative range overlap thresholds) using datasets of avian sister pairs (n = 1283 – 1321) sampled from 100 posterior trees.

Table S7. Median parameter values for the relationships between parapatry and sympatry rate and sexual dichromatism (under alternative range overlap thresholds) using datasets of avian sister pairs (n = 1283 – 1321) sampled from 100 posterior trees.

Table S8. Multi-predictor model of variation in sympatry rate among sister pairs of birds (dataset 2; n = 1306) using alternative range overlap thresholds to define sympatry.

676 **Table S9.** Multi-predictor model of variation in parapatry and sympatry rate among sister pairs of
677 birds (dataset 2; n = 1306) using alternative range overlap thresholds (%; parapatry / sympatry).




Figure 1. The relationship between pair age and sexual dichromatism across avian sister pairs based on (a) spectrophotometric and (b) human estimates of dichromatism (n = 144 pairs in dataset 1, and 1306 pairs in dataset 2, respectively)




Figure 2. The effect of dichromatism on rates of transition from allopatry to parapatry (a,c) and parapatry to sympatry (b,d) based on spectrophotometric (a,b) and visual (c,d) estimates of dichromatism in avian sister pairs ($n = 140$ pairs in dataset 1, and 1306 pairs in dataset 2, respectively). Plotted rate estimates are mean values (solid line) with 95% confidence intervals (grey shading) using range overlap thresholds of <5%, 5-25% and >25% to categorise species as allopatric, parapatric and sympatric, respectively. Asterisks (*) denote significant ($\alpha = 0.05$) effects (see Table S2).

Table 1. Estimates of speciation and extinction rates across gradients of increasing sexual dichromatism.

Parameter	Estimate	ΔAICc
<i>Dataset 1</i>		
Speciation intercept	0.06	–
Speciation slope	0.19	3.69
Extinction intercept	0.00	–
Extinction slope	0.01	–2.12
<i>Dataset 2</i>		
Speciation intercept	0.08	–
Speciation slope	0.03	11.19
Extinction intercept	0.01	–
Extinction slope	0.02	–2.84

ΔAICc values quantify the improvement in model fit (positive values) compared to constant-rate models in which the focal slope parameter(s) were constrained to be zero. In each case, support for slope parameters was non-significant when compared to critical ΔAICc values derived from simulated datasets (see Table S2).

Table 2. Models of the relationship between parapatry and sympatry rate and sexual dichromatism across sister pairs of birds using alternative range overlap thresholds to assign parapatry and sympatry.

Thresholds (%; para/sym)	N (allo/para/ sym)	Parameter	Hazard ratio [95% CI]	ΔAICc
Dataset 1				
0-20 / >20	43 / 33 / 64	ap	1.85 [1.96, 2.85]	5.58*
		ps	1.00 [0.52, 1.92]	−2.09
5-15 / >25	54 / 31 / 55	ap	1.74 [1.13, 2.68]	4.06*
		ps	0.73 [0.36, 1.48]	−1.28
10-30 / >30	60 / 32 / 48	ap	1.80 [1.15, 2.81]	4.31*
		ps	0.86 [0.43, 1.75]	−1.92
Dataset 2				
0-20 / >20	600 / 283 / 423	ap	1.45 [1.25, 1.68]	20.60*
		ps	1.55 [1.16, 2.08]	6.90
5-15 / >25	750 / 163 / 393	ap	1.53 [1.30, 1.80]	22.35*
		ps	1.23 [0.86, 1.76]	−0.63
10-30 / >30	804 / 134 / 386	ap	1.49 [1.26, 1.77]	17.64*
		ps	1.17 [0.79, 1.74]	−1.35

Hazard ratios refer to the ratio of transition rates per unit change in dichromatism. To aid comparison, dichromatism values were standardised prior to analysis. ΔAICc values quantify the improvement in model fit (positive values) compared to constant-rate models. Asterisks (*) denote significant ($\alpha = 0.05$) ΔAICc values compared to null expectations. allo = allopatric; para = parapatric; sym = sympatric; ap = allopatry to parapatry; ps = parapatry to sympatry.